UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,663	11/25/2003	Wei-Lun Lo	MSFT-2751/304827.1	5635

			EXAMINER
41505 7590 11/14/2006			AHLUWALIA, NAVNEET K

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/721,663	LO, WEI-LUN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Navneet K. Ahluwalia	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _17 August 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is in response to the Amendment filed August 17, 2006.

Response to Arguments

2.   Claims 1 – 20 are pending in this Office Action. After a further search and a
thorough examination of the present application, claims 1 – 20 remain rejected.
Applicant's arguments filed with respect to claims 1 – 20 have been fully considered but
they are not persuasive.

First, *Applicant argues that there is no teaching in Ingersoll or Hind of an
annotated schema comprising a model of a flat file.*

*In response to Applicant's argument, the Examiner states that as previously
stated Ingersoll does not explicitly disclose the tokens and annotations where as Hind
teaches the tokens and the annotations in paragraph 0097 lines 13 – 21.* In response to
applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show
nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on
combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA
1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Second, *Applicant argues that there is no teaching in Ingersoll or Hind of
translating characters of the native format into tokens, parsing the tokens and producing
XML file by converting the first native format to an XML format.*

In response to Applicant's argument, the Examiner states that as previously stated Ingersoll discloses translating characters of the native format into tokens, parsing the tokens and producing XML file by converting the first native format to an XML format in paragraph 0021 Ingersoll where syntactic transformations using a common syntactic base and EDI and OAG documents are converted in to an XML (common syntactic base) paragraph 0021, Ingersoll.

Claims 9 and 16 recite the same subject matter and for the same reasons as cited above the rejection is maintained.

Hence, Applicant's arguments do not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art of record. In light of the foregoing arguments, the 103 rejections are sustained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.　　The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.　　Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ingersoll et al. ('Ingersoll' herein after) (US 2004/0025117 A1) further in view of Hind et al. ('Hind' herein after) (US 2002/0161801 A1).

With respect to claim 1,

Ingersoll discloses a method of converting between a non-XML flat file and an

XML file, comprising the steps of:

- receiving the flat file in a native format (paragraph 0021 lines 1 – 12,

    Ingersoll);

- translating characters of the native format into tokens (paragraph 0021 lines

    12 – 19, Ingersoll);

- parsing the tokens (paragraph 0035 lines 18 – 22, Ingersoll); and

- producing an XML file by converting the first native format to an XML format

    with the use of at least one annotated schema comprising a model of a flat file

    (paragraph 0030 lines 1 – 18, Ingersoll).

Ingersoll however does not explicitly disclose the tokens and the annotations as

claimed.

Hind teaches the tokens and the annotations as claimed in paragraph 0097 lines

13 – 21, Hind.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at

the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because

both the references are in the same field of conversion of documents for interoperability

and exchange. Furthermore, the conversion into a standard format would decrease the

overhead of routing and extracting information (paragraph 0020, Hind).

5.   Claims 2 – 8 are rejected on the same rationale as claim 1. The limitations are

cited below.

With respect to claim 2,

Hind teaches the method of claim 1, wherein translating characters comprises

generating tokens for one or more of a delimiter, a tag and a value (paragraph 0065 and

0067, Hind).

With respect to claim 3,

Ingersoll discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one annotated

schema comprises an XML schema with annotations (paragraph 0004, Ingersoll).

With respect to claim 4,

Ingersoll discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the at least one annotated

schema defines the flat file model (paragraph 0028 lines 11 – 16, Ingersoll).

With respect to claim 5,

Hind discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the native record type has one of

a delimited format and a positional format (paragraph 0051 where the XML is inherently

in a delimited and positional format).

With respect to claim 6,

Hind teaches the method of claim 5, wherein each format comprises an optional

tag for identifying a record (paragraph 0006 lines 19 – 24, Hind).

With respect to claim 7,

Hind teaches the method of claim 6, wherein the tag provides context for use

with parsing the tokens (paragraph 0059, Hind).

With respect to claim 8,

Hind teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising converting the XML file to

a second native file by serializing (paragraph 0049 and 0091).

With respect to claim 9,

Ingersoll discloses a machine-readable medium having machine-readable

instructions for performing a method of converting between a non-XML flat file and an

XML file, comprising the steps of:

- receiving the non-XML flat file in a native format (paragraph 0021 lines 1 – 12,

  Ingersoll);

- translating characters of the native format input into tokens (paragraph 0021

  lines 12 – 19, Ingersoll); and

- parsing the tokens (paragraph 0035 lines 18 – 22, Ingersoll) to produce an

  XML file by converting a first native format to an XML format with the use of at

least one annotated schema comprising a model of a flat file format

(paragraph 0030 lines 1 – 18, Ingersoll).

Ingersoll however does not explicitly disclose the tokens and the annotations as

claimed.

Hind teaches the tokens and the annotations as claimed in paragraph 0097 lines

13 – 21, Hind.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at

the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because

both the references are in the same field of conversion of documents for interoperability

and exchange. Furthermore, the conversion into a standard format would decrease the

overhead of routing and extracting information (paragraph 0020, Hind).

6.   Claims 10 – 15 are rejected on the same rationale as claim 9. The limitations are

cited below.

With respect to claim 10,

Ingersoll discloses the machine-readable medium of claim 9, wherein the at least

one annotated schema comprises XML schemas with annotations (paragraph 0004,

Ingersoll).

With respect to claim 11,

Ingersoll discloses the machine-readable medium of claim 9, wherein the at lest one annotated schema defines the model (paragraph 0028 lines 11 – 16, Ingersoll).

With respect to claim 12,

Hind discloses the machine-readable medium of claim 9, wherein the model has one of a delimited format and a positional format (paragraph 0051 where the XML is inherently in a delimited and positional format).

With respect to claim 13,

Hind teaches the machine-readable medium of claim 12, wherein each format comprises an optional tag which helps identify a record (paragraph 0006 lines 19 – 24, Hind).

With respect to claim 14,

Hind teaches the machine-readable medium of claim 13, wherein the tag provides context for use with parsing the tokens (paragraph 0059, Hind).

With respect to claim 15,

Hind teaches the machine-readable medium of claim 9, further comprising converting the XML file to a second native file by serializing (paragraph 0049 and 0091).

With respect to claim 16,

Ingersoll discloses a system for transferring files as part of a workflow comprising: a processor, supporting hardware and software functions of the system;

- an input device for receiving a non-XML flat file in a native format (paragraph 0021 lines 1 – 12, Ingersoll);

- a text reader and tokenizer for reading and translating flat file characters of the native format input into tokens (paragraph 0021 lines 12 – 19, Ingersoll);

- a parsing device which converts the tokens to characters in an XML file with the use of at least one annotated schema comprising a model of the native format (paragraph 0035 lines 18 – 22, Ingersoll); and

- an output device for transmitting converted files; wherein the processor executes instructions supporting file format conversion using the parser to convert files according to a workflow (paragraph 0030 lines 1 – 18, Ingersoll).

Ingersoll however does not explicitly disclose the tokens and the annotations as claimed.

Hind teaches the tokens and the annotations as claimed in paragraph 0097 lines 13 – 21, Hind.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of data processing at the time of the present invention to combine the teachings of cited references because both the references are in the same field of conversion of documents for interoperability and exchange. Furthermore, the conversion into a standard format would decrease the overhead of routing and extracting information (paragraph 0020, Hind).

7.   Claims 17 – 20 are rejected on the same rationale as claim 16. The limitations

are cited below.

With respect to claim 17,

Hind teaches the system of claim 16, further comprising a serializer device which

converts an XML file format back into a native format (paragraph 0049 and 0091).

With respect to claim 18,

Ingersoll discloses the system of claim 16, wherein the at least one annotated

schema comprises an XML schema with annotations (paragraph 0004, Ingersoll).

With respect to claim 19,

Hind discloses the system of claim 16, wherein the native format has one of a

delimited format and a positional format (paragraph 0051 where the XML is inherently in

a delimited and positional format).

With respect to claim 20,

Hind teaches the system of claim 19, wherein each format comprises an optional

tag for identifying a record (paragraph 0006 lines 19 – 24, Hind).

Conclusion

8.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Navneet K. Ahluwalia whose telephone number is 571-

272-5636. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alam T. Hosain can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Navneet K. Ahluwalia
Examiner
Art Unit 2166

Dated: 11/11/2006

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER